

Exhibit A.6



Mayer Brown LLP
71 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-4637

Main Tel +1 312 782 0600
Main Fax +1 312 701 7711
www.mayerbrown.com

March 6, 2019

BY E-MAIL

Michael N. Nemelka
KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL & FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.
1615 M Street, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-3215

Matthew D. Provance
Direct Tel +1 312 701 8598
Direct Fax +1 312 706 9397
mprovance@mayerbrown.com

Peggy J. Wedgworth
MILBERG TADLER PHILLIPS GROSSMAN LLP
One Pennsylvania Plaza
New York, NY 10119

Re: *In re Dealer Management Systems Antitrust Litig.,*
MDL No. 2817, Case No. 18-CV-864 (N.D. Ill.)

Dear Mike and Peggy:

In addition to the Reynolds-specific response that you received on March 5, I write on behalf of CDK Global, LLC (“CDK”) in response to the list of discovery issues identified in Liz McKenna’s February 26, 2019 email sent on behalf of Plaintiffs in advance of the parties’ in-person meet-and-confer and status hearing last week. We would appreciate it if Plaintiffs would respond to the discovery issues identified in Defendants’ email responding to Ms. McKenna’s February 26 email, also sent on February 26, before the parties further meet-and-confer.

1. **“Refresh” of Financial Information.** As noted in Reynolds’s response, we also need to understand the specific parameters of Plaintiffs’ proposal and whether Plaintiffs will agree to reciprocity for any “refresh” production of financial information.

2. **Interrogatory re: DMS Customer “Tenure”.** As to CDK, we had understood that this issue was resolved. *See* 12/05/2018 Ltr. from J. Michaels to D. Ho and P. Wedgworth.

3. **OEM Pricing Information.** We believe that the most recent correspondence on this issue (as it relates to CDK) was exchanged in December 2018. *See* 12/17/2018 Ltr. from M. Provance to M. Nemelka. We stand by our prior response.

4. **Reynolds Competitive Intelligence Files.** N/A as to CDK.

Michael N. Nemelka
Peggy J. Wedgworth
March 6, 2019
Page 2

5. **Reynolds Redactions.** N/A as to CDK.

6. **Pre-2013 Documents re: “Independent Integrators”.** CDK’s offer to review additional pre-2013 documents from certain custodians that may relate to the use of “independent integrators” was made several months ago. *See, e.g.*, 01/09/2019 Ltr. from M. Provance to M. Nemelka and E. McKenna. Plaintiffs did not accept CDK’s proposal or make any counter-proposals. At this point, as fact discovery is coming to a close, CDK has wound down its document review resources. As such, we believe that the appropriate time to engage in a supplemental review of pre-2013 documents—the relevance of which is marginal, at best—has now passed. That said, if Plaintiffs would like to meet-and-confer about the issue now, we are willing to do so.

7. **PX-442.** N/A as to CDK.

8. **Privilege Issues.** It appears to us that the privilege issues identified in Plaintiffs’ February 26 email have either been resolved or raised with the Court in motions practice.

9. **DMI/IntegraLink Data.** On February 27, 2019, we produced an additional document, CDK-3112792, containing the requested DMI and IntegraLink data. *See* 02/27/2019 Ltr. from D. Fenske to M. Nemelka, P. Wedgworth, and B. Ross.

10. **ReverseRisk Subpoena.** N/A as to CDK.

Regards,

/s/ Matthew D. Provance
Matthew D. Provance

cc: Plaintiffs’ Co-Lead Counsel; Defense Counsel